

The following letter was inadvertently not included in the briefing material, but was received prior to the public comment deadline.

Kate Taylor,

As you know, I have a history with the Commission and regard it as a very fine example of democratic cooperation in resource management. This democracy, however, does not make it always easy to make hard/needed decisions such as restricting or closing harvest since those actions affect the people in the various States.

For example, I am disappointed in Addendum IV since it does not include options such as closing the total eel fishery. Such options would have been inline with the concerns in the very detailed Stock Assessment Document. However, Addendum IV is very much focused only on very regional (state by state) management and therefore not holistic. And, this focus appears to be to try to postpone/ignore the painful (to fishers, managers, and politicians) required action needed to stop the key anthropogenic stress of all harvest. Stopping this stress is difficult, but most doable, compared to the other local, regional, population, or global-wide anthropogenic stresses that eel are now facing (see attachment).

A holistic review of the eel situation is underway due to the petition to list it under the US ESA. This process includes a review of current management actions and its application to the protection of the species. Addendum IV does not express concern about the current or proposed management adequacy. As such, it seems to indirectly support the need for outside management action for the survival of this species such as listing it as a Threatened Species under the US ESA.

Managers know that such a listing would have a great impact on many management action and related costs to society. This is especially true for this species due to its very large coastal and inland range. Therefore, I urge the ASMFC to take the most proactive/preventive action within its authority and totally close the American eel fishery. And, I would encourage the Commission to request that their sister agency, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, implement the same.

Further, if the ASMFC wanted to be more proactive, the Commission could also identify American eel as its 1st “species of direct concern” (or some similar designation). Such a designation would be beneficial in alerting **all** the management agencies in the Atlantic coastal watersheds that eels need special protection including assistance in up and downstream passage. Such a designation would help all reviewers of COE, EPA, and FERC regulatory activities in considering the needs of American eels. Of course, the listing of Am. Eels as a ESA species would change the word “consider” to “require” for all local, state, and federally regulated activities within its very large range.

Best wishes,

Dieter

Wolf-Dieter N. Busch

1705 Angelina Court

Crownsville, MD 21032-1935

Phone: 410.451.9301

www.EIAdvisoryServices.com

**Draft Addendum IV to the
Interstate Fishery Management Plan for American Eel**

WRITTEN COMMENT SUMMARIES

**Prepared for Consideration of the
American Eel Management Board
August 2014**

Written Comment Summary on the American Eel Draft Addendum IV

In total, 62 individual written comment letters were received and 18 comments were received by groups or organizations. A form letter, initiated by the American Eel Farm, prompted 24 letters.

Individual Comments

The majority of comments on the glass eel fishery were in favor of Option 2 (2014 Measures) or Option 1 (Status Quo). Six comments were in favor of and four comments were opposed to a closure of the glass eel fishery. One comment supported and three were in opposition of Option 7 (Aquaculture Quota).

Three comments were opposed to any type of quota management for the yellow eel fishery and one comment was in support of the status quo. One comment was in support of Option 4c (2010 Quota with a 20% reduction) and one comment was in support of Option 5c (Weighted Quota with a 20% reduction). One comment was in support of Option 8 (Catch Cap).

For the proposed silver eel measures, one comment was in support of the status quo (Option 1). Three comments were in support of an extension on the sunset provision (Option 2) and the time closure (Option 3). Two comment were in support of the license cap (Option 4).

Comments on the silver eel options were about evenly distributed between the Status quo (5 in support), Option 2 (Extension of the sunset provision, 5 in support), Option 3 (Time closure, 4 in support) and Option 4 (License Cap, 4 in support).

Two commenters were in support of the State Sustainability Plan, specifically the aquaculture plan.

Group/Organization Comments

Comments were received from the following organizations:

- Alewife Harvesters of Maine
- Chester Conservation Commission
- Farmington River Watershed Association
- Maine Elver Fishermen's Association
- Massachusetts Marine Fisheries Advisory Commission
- Mystic River Watershed Association
- National Association of State Aquaculture Coordinators
- New Jersey Marine Fisheries Commission
- North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation
- North Carolina Aquaculture Association
- North Carolina Department of Agriculture
- Park Watershed
- South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority
- Save the Bay
- TNC
- Upper Delaware Council
- National Park Service - Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River
- Wild Oceans

Under the glass eel options, nine organizations were in favor of a closure of the glass eel fishery, with two organizations in support of an immediate closure and three in support of a delayed closures. Six organizations supported Option 9 (Reporting Requirements) and Option 10 (Monitoring Requirements). Five organizations were in favor of Option 4c (Quota based on 2010 landings) and Option 6 (Quota Transfer).

Two organization were in support of and one organization was opposed to Option 2 (2014 Measures). One organization expressed opposition to Option 5 (Quota Overages) and Option 6 (Stock Enhancement Programs). One organization was in support of and one organization was in opposition to the Status Quo.

Under the yellow eel options, three organizations commented in opposition to quota management and three were in support of the status quo. Six organizations were in support of quota management and, specifically, four organizations supported Option 4 (20% reduction of 2010 landings).

The majority of comments on the state sustainable fishing plans were supportive.

Form Letter

24 form letters were received in support of the American Eel Farm and Option 3.1.4 State Sustainable Fishing Plans – Aquaculture Plan. The form letters included comments on the economic importance of the facility and also the potential benefits through stocking and monitoring that the facility could provide.

Additional Comments

Additional in individual and group comments included (in descending order of appearance):

- concern over the population
- stressed that eels are an important part of the ecosystem,
- concerns over hydropower dams and downstream passage access,
- concern over illegal harvest and poaching,
- requested general protection for glass eels,
- that the glass eel fisheries provide an important economic opportunity in Maine,
- that the Commission should consider the use of cull patches,
- more research is needed,
- that the Commission consider a ½ by 1 inch mesh requirement,
- that all fisheries should be closed,
- that fyke nets are negatively impacting river herring spawning runs,
- the impact of horseshoe crab restrictions has already decreased landings,
- states need more flexibility in management,
- consider closing the commercial season from May – June, and
- that water quality is an issue.

Table 1. Public comment summary

		Public Hearings		Individual Comments		Group Comments		Form Comments	Total Support	Total Opposed
		Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed			
Proposed Glass Eel Fishery Management Measures										
Option 1	Status Quo	11		8		1	1		20	1
Option 2	2014 Measures	14		11		2	1		27	1
Option 3	Closure	4	8	4	4	4	1		12	13
	<i>3a - Immediate</i>		2	2		2	2		4	4
	<i>3b -Phased In</i>		2			3	2		3	4
Option4	Quota	1	8				1		1	9
	<i>4a - 2004-13 landings</i>		2				3		0	5
	<i>4b - 20% reduction</i>	1	2				3		1	5
	<i>4c - 2010 landings</i>		3			5	2		5	5
Option 5	Quota Overages	2	5			5	1		7	6
Option 6	Stock Enhancement	8	2			2	1		10	3
	<i>6a - 5% Harvest Cap</i>	2				2			4	0
	<i>6b - 10% Harvest Cap</i>	2				2			4	0
	<i>6c - 25% Harvest Cap</i>	2				2			4	0
Option 7	Aquaculture Quota	3	13	1	3	2	2		6	18
Option 8	Aquaculture Permit	1	9			1	2		2	11
Option 9	Reporting	9	1			6			15	1
Option 10	Monitoring	14	1			6			20	1

		Public Hearings		Individual		Group Comments		Form Comments	Total Support	Total Opposed
		Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed			
Proposed Yellow Eel Fishery Management Measures										
Option 1	Status Quo	29	1	1		3	1		33	2
Option 2	Adjusted Quota 1				3		2		0	5
	<i>2a - No Reduction</i>						2		0	2
	<i>2b - 10% Reduction</i>						2		0	2
	<i>2c - 20% Reduction</i>						2		0	2
Option 3	Adjusted Quota 2		3		3		3		0	9
	<i>3a - No Reduction</i>		3				2		0	5
	<i>3b - 10% Reduction</i>		3				2		0	5
	<i>3c - 20% Reduction</i>	1	3				2		1	5
Option 4	2010 Quota		3		3	1	2		1	8
	<i>4a - No Reduction</i>		3				2		0	5
	<i>4b - 10% Reduction</i>		3			1	2		1	5
	<i>4c - 20% Reduction</i>	1	3	1		4	2		6	5
Option 5	Weighted Quota		3		3		3		0	9
	<i>5a - No Reduction</i>		3				2		0	5
	<i>5b - 10% Reduction</i>		3				2		0	5
	<i>5c - 20% Reduction</i>	1	3	1		1	2		3	5
Option 6	Quota Overages	1	1			2	2		3	3
Option 7	Quota Transfers	2	2			3			5	2
Option 8	Catch Cap		1	1			2		1	3
	<i>8a - No Reduction</i>						1		0	1
	<i>8b - 10% Reduction</i>						1		0	1
	<i>8c - 20% Reduction</i>						1		0	1

		Public Hearings		Individual		Group Comments		Form Comments	Total Support	Total Opposed
		Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed	Support	Opposed			
Proposed Silver Eel Fishery Management Measures										
Option 1	Status Quo	2		1		5			8	0
Option 2	Sunset Extension	9		3		5			17	0
Option 3	Time Closure	2		3		4			9	0
Option 4	License Cap	3		2		4			9	0
State Sustainable Fishing Plans										
Fishing Mortality Plan		7				2	1		9	1
Aquaculture Plan		5		2		6	1	24	37	1
Transfer Plan		4				2	1		6	1

**Draft Addendum IV to the
Interstate Fishery Management Plan for American Eel**

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARIES

**Prepared for Consideration of the
American Eel Management Board
August 2014**

August 2014

Summary

Fourteen public hearings were held in 12 states. Public hearings were held in all states with the exception of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, Georgia and Florida. The state of Maine held two public hearings. The state of New York held one public hearing and also one information session. There was public attendance at all hearings. There was 177 people in attendance at all public hearings. Of that, 74 were at the two public hearings in Maine, 22 at the two public hearings in New York and 17 at the public hearing in Maryland. There were also countless state staff that attended the public hearings.

Under the proposed glass eel fishery management options the majority of comments were in support of Option 10 (Monitoring) and Option 1 and 2 (Status Quo and 2014 Management Measures). There was considerable confusion on the difference between Options 1 and 2. Many commenters used the two options interchangeably and likely they should be considered together. The majority of opposing comments were directed at Option 7 (Aquaculture Quota), Option 3 (Closure) and Option 4 (Quota Management).

Under the proposed yellow eel fishery management options the majority of comments were in support of the status quo. Commenters suggested alternative regulations ranging from a 1 x 1/2 “ mesh requirement, to limited entry, to requiring eel specific licenses. Opposing comments were directed at options pertaining to quota management.

Under proposed silver eel fishery management options the majority of comments received were in support of Option 2 (Extension of Sunset Provision).

Other general comments focused on the need for habitat restoration, increasing access to habitat, and reduction of turbine mortality. Comments also focused on poaching and illegal harvest and the need for increased enforcement and fines; that the stock is not declining; and concern for underreporting. Additional comments stated that the regulations for the 1/2 by 1/2 mesh requirement and the 9 inch minimum size under Addendum III are unclear and inconsistent and a tolerance was needed.

Maine Department of Marine Resources

Brewer and Hallowell, Maine

June 30, 2014

Public Attendance: 74 in attendance. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

Terry Stockwell, MDMR

Rep. Walter Kumiega, Commissioner

Pat Keliher, Commissioner

Summary

The majority of comments given on the glass eel fishery were in favor of Option 1 (Status Quo) or Option 2 (2014 Measures) and Option 10 (Monitoring requirements). Additionally, the majority of comments given were in opposition to Option 3 (Closure), Option 4 (Quota Management) and Option 7 (Aquaculture Quota) for the glass eel fishery. A few commenters expressed that the aquaculture quota should not be taken from the fishermen.

Five comments were in support of the status quo for the yellow eel fishery, with a few comments given in support of quota management and the allowance for quota transfers if quota management is implemented. Five comments given in support of allowing the silver eel fishery to continue. Three comments were given in support of the State Sustainable Fishing Plans.

Many comments expressed that turbine mortality at dams is a major issue and there needs to be more fish passage or work to facilitate outward migration. Many individuals commented that there is a lot of information that we don't know about eels, including the survival rate and carrying capacity. Additionally, management (especially quota management) needs to be based on more recent data and the population is improving. The upcoming AFS conference may also provide valuable information. A few comments stated that the glass eel fishery had already taken a much larger reduction than other fisheries. There was also a comment that an online forum should be set up to allow fishermen to debate these issues and provide data.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 1 – 11 people commented in support of the Status Quo
- Option 2 – 12 people commented in support of the 2014 measures
- Option 3 – Eight people commented in opposition to the closure, with two people each specifically opposed to option 3a and 3b.
- Option 4 – Eight people commented in opposition to quota management, with two people each opposed to option 4a and 4b and three people opposed to option 4c.
- Option 5 – Two people were in support of and one person was in opposition to allowing overages. Comments were given that if overages were allowed then underages should also be allowed.

- Option 6 – Six comments were in support of and two comments were opposed to the stock enhancement programs. Two commenters stated that either the date should go back to 2009 or Maine should get credit for its work to remove dams.
- Option 7 – 12 people were opposed to the aquaculture overages, many vehemently.
- Option 8 – Nine comments were in opposition to the aquaculture permit
- Option 9 – Eight comments were in support of the reporting requirements, many noting that Maine is currently doing this
- Option 10 – 10 people were in support of the monitoring requirements and expressed that there needs to be more data collection in all fisheries.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 - Five people were in support of the status quo
- Option 3 – One person supported Option 3c
- Option 4 – One person supported Option 4c.
- Option 6 – One person supported quota overages, and also suggested underages should be allowed to be used.
- Option 7 – Two commenters supported quota transfers.

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 1 – One individual supported the status quo
- Option 2 – Five people commented in favor of an extension of the sunset provision
- Option 3 – One person supported the time closure
- Option 4 – Two people commented in favor of the license cap

Sustainable Fishing Plans

Three comments were given in support of the state sustainable fishing plans.

New Hampshire Fish and Game
Portsmouth, New Hampshire
June 23, 2014

Public Attendance: 2 attendees. See sign in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Mike Waine, ASMFC

Dennis Abbott, Commissioner

Doug Grout, Commissioner

Ritchie White, Commissioner

Commercial Management Measures

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

There was a discussion about which options would provide New Hampshire the opportunity to harvest glass eels. This included option 6, an allowance based on stock enhancement programs or a sustainable fishery plan that would transfer yellow eel quota to the glass eel fishery. The consensus was that New Hampshire should pursue any opportunity that would allow the state to harvest glass eels.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

No comments provided

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

No comments provided

Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries

Bourne, Massachusetts

July 1, 2014

Public Attendance: 6 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

Brad Chase, MA DMF

Dan McKiernan, MA DMF

Summary

The majority of the discussion focused on the issue of poaching and the activity that has been seen in Massachusetts waters this year. One fishermen commented that he had he wanted to fish this year but, due to the poaching activity he saw in the rivers, did not set his nets. There were comments that towns in Massachusetts have done a lot to restore habitat and access for anadromous fish and are spending a lot on enforcement to deter poaching.

Commercial Management Measures

Glass Eel Fisheries

- One individual was in support of Option 3 (Closure) as a way to address poaching problems and conservation concerns
- One comment was in support of Option 6. Additionally, the commenter believed that there should be more done to tie restoration into management measures
- There was one comment to use harvest of glass eels to fund aquaculture or monitoring.
- One individual was in support of Option 10 (Monitoring).

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

No comments provided

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

No comments provided

Other Comments

- There were many comments on the prevalence of poaching that is occurring in Massachusetts waters. There was a discussion on the need for higher fines (as is proposed in H-3782 by Rep. Sarah Peake) and that the area for law enforcement officials to patrol is too large.
- There was a comment on the need for improved access to habitat and habitat restoration.
- There was one comment that people are underreporting or not reporting.

Rhode Island Division of Fish and Wildlife
Narragansett, Rhode Island
June 24, 2014

Public Attendance: 3 members of the public. See sign in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Mike Waine, ASMFC
Bob Ballou, Commissioner
Jason McNamee, RI DEM
Phil Edwards, RI DEM
Christine Dudly, RI DEM

Summary

There was general support for the programs to enhance the stock that would provide more fishing opportunities in Rhode Island. There was a discussion on disease and natural mortality.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 2 – 1 comment was in support on the 2014 measures but the individual would not like to see a glass eel fishing in Rhode Island as fishing on the juvenile stage is not sustainable.
- Option 4 – 1 comment in support in favor of quota management
- Options 6, 7, and 8 – Two people were in favor of the stock enhancement programs, the aquaculture quota, and aquaculture permitting.
- Option 9, 10 – 1 individual supported increased reporting and monitoring requirements.
- Two commenters were in support of allowing glass eel harvest in Rhode Island and that all states should be allowed to participate in the fishery.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- No comments

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 1 – 1 in favor
- Option 3 – 1 in favor

Other Comments

- One commenter stated that there needs to be more done to increase access to available habitat
- One individual thought turbine mortality is a problem.
- One comment was in support of domestic aquaculture and one comment suggested stocking as a means to enhance the wild populations.
- There are large fluctuations in the populations due to environmental factors out of our control.
- The Commission should work hard to manage the yellow eel fishery, but he is not in favor of closing it.

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection

Rocky Hill, Connecticut

June 24, 2014

Public Attendance: 13 public in attendance. No sign-in sheet available.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 4 – One individual stated that 2013 landings data should not be included in quota determination because the landings were very high last year.
- Option 7 – One comment was not in support of giving to one business at the expense of others, unless it helps form a sustainable fishery.
- One commenter states that the export data is very different than harvest data and if the fishery is closed it will put more pressure on yellow eels.
- Five individuals were in support of the Commission approving the most conservative measures.
- One individual stated that managers should wait to see what the USFWS determination concludes.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- No comments were given as there is a very limited commercial yellow eel fishery in Connecticut.

Other Comments

- Need better enforcement

New York Department of Environmental Conservation
East Setauket, New York
July 14, 2014

Public Attendance: 7 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC
Carol Hoffman, NY DEC
Jim Gilmore, Commissioner
Emerson Hasbrouck, Commissioner

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 3 – Two commenters were in support of a closure
- Option 4 - One commenter was in support of 4b, but also stated that 2013 should not be included in quota determination
- Option 7 – One individual was in support of an aquaculture quota

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 - Two comments were in support of the status quo
- Option 5 - One individual was in support of Option 5c which would be a 20% reduction but still provide a higher quota than what was landed in 2010.
- One commenter was in support of a 1 x ½” mesh requirement.

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 2 – Two commenters were in support of allowing the fishery to continue

Other Comments

- Two comments stated that there is a lot of confusion about what to report, between food and bait licenses and that underreporting is an issue.
- There is too much uncertainty on life history and population.
- Predation by cormorants is an issue.
- Need to improve habitat access and quality
- One commenters believed that the Commission was in violation of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the National Standards.

New York Department of Environmental Conservation
Narrowsburg, New York
July 30, 2014

Public Attendance: Ten fishers were present at the meeting, along with several staff from NYSDEC and National Parks Service, and the executive director of the Upper Delaware Council. No sign-in sheet available.

Summary

NYSDEC held a public informational meeting on American eel Draft Addendum IV and distributed copies of the draft addendum to the attendees.

Most all fishers believe that the impacts of this fishery are small when compared to the rest of the Atlantic coast. They questioned and opposed the continued fishing on glass eels as well as the large fisheries for yellow eel as bait. They also questioned the variety of options allowed for the glass and yellow eel fisheries compared to the few options allowed for the silver eel fishery.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- No comments given

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- No comments given

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 1 - Those providing comment were opposed to the status quo
- Option 2 - Those providing comment were also opposed to an extension of any impending closure, as it was left open ended with no definition.
- Option 3 - Some commenters in support of a variant of a seasonal closure was acceptable
- Some indicated a preference for Option 4.
- The suggestion was to begin with a license cap but more data were needed before making any permanent decisions.

New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife
Galloway, New Jersey
July 10, 2014

Public Attendance: 6 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

Brandon Muffley, NJ DFW

Adam Nowalsky, Commissioner (proxy)

Jeff Brust, NJ DFW

Russ Allen, NJ DFW

Jenn Pyle, NJ DFW

Summary

The majority of individuals providing comment were in support of the status quo for the yellow eel fishery and suggested that limited entry should be considered before a quota system. There were comments that underreporting is an issue which needed to be addressed before a quota is implemented. Additionally, there were questions brought up on how the issue of holding eels (i.e. for the Christmas markets) would be factored into quota monitoring? Additionally, there were comments that the prohibition on bait significantly impacted the fishery.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 3 – One commenter was in support of a closure.
- Option 7 – One individual was in support of allowing glass eel harvest only for aquaculture

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1- Four commenters were in favor of the status quo.
- One individual requested that if overages are considered, then underages should also be included.
- Four people were in support of limited entry for the yellow eel fishery. One person stated that if that doesn't work then the state can go to quota management.
- One person was in favor of a specific eel license.

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 2 – One person supported allowing the fishery to continue.

Other Comments

- Regulations for the ½ by ½ mesh requirement and the 9 inch minimum size under Addendum III are unclear and inconsistent.
- Two people commented that the stock is data poor and we should wait to see the results of Addendum III as well as any results that come out of the AFS conference in Quebec.
- One individual from DVF stated that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first, latent effort needs to be addressed, that there needs to be more done to increase access to available habitat and that turbine mortality is a problem.

Delaware Dept. of Natural Resources & Environmental Control

Dover, Delaware

July 8, 2014

Public Attendance: 9 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

John Clark, Commissioner (proxy)

Roy Miller, Commissioner

Summary

The majority of those providing comments were in support of the status quo for the yellow eel fishery. Additionally, comments were provided that there should be more flexibility given to the states to manage their fisheries. There were a few comments that landings data are inaccurate and that the prohibition on bait significantly impacted the fishery. Additionally, there were concerns that the majority of the mortality is not coming from the fishermen and those other issues (e.g. dams and pollution) need to be addressed.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- One commenter stated that there is no glass eel fishery in Delaware so wouldn't provide comments on how they should manage their fishery and wouldn't want them dictating how the Delaware fishery is managed.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1- Four commenters were in support of the status quo.
- Options 2 – 7 - One commenter was in opposition to all quota management (and associated) options. One commenter requested that if quota management is selected than there should be an automatic re-evaluation of the quota after 2 – 5 years.
- Option 8 – One commenter was in opposition of a catch cap

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 2 – One person was in support of allowing the fishery to continue at its current size.

Other Comments

- Two individuals mentioned that the fishery is data poor and we have no control over where the eels recruit to.
- Two comments stated that landings are increasing and that the fishery is healthy
- Two commenters from DVF requested that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first. Additionally, that we should wait to see the results that come out of the AFS conference in Quebec.
- One commenter stated that we should wait to see the results of Addendum III.
- One commenter requested additional economic impact analysis be provided before any decisions are made.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Annapolis, Maryland
July 2, 2014

Public Attendance: 8 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

Keith Whiteford, MD DNR

Summary

There was unanimous support for the status quo for the yellow eel fishery.

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 2 – One person was in support of the 2014 measures and that we should wait and see how the new regulations work
- Option 9 – One individual was in support of increased reporting
- Option 10 – One individual was in support of increased monitoring

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 – 17 people were in support of the status quo

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- No comments given

Other Comments

- One individual said the amount of eels he is seeing now is better than he has ever seen.
- One individual from DVF requested that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first and that we should wait to see the results that come out of the AFS conference in Quebec.
- One individual from DVF stated that there needs to be more done to increase access to available habitat and that turbine mortality is a problem. Additionally, the population was not in a decline and biomass is increasing.

Potomac River Fisheries Commission
Colonial Beach, Virginia
July 26, 2014

Public Attendance: 5 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC
Ellen Cosby, PRFC

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- No comments given

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 – One person was in favor of the status quo.
- Option 2 – 5 – One person was in opposition to quota management

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- Option 4 – One person thought that the license cap was the easiest way to manage the fishery.

Sustainable Fishing Plans

- One comment was given in support of the state sustainable fishing plans, specifically the fishing mortality plan.

Other Comments

- Three people stated that the regulations for the ½ by ½ mesh requirement and the 9 inch minimum size under Addendum III are unclear and inconsistent and a tolerance is needed
- Two commenters stated that we should wait to see the results of Addendum III.
- Two people commented that the population is increasing.
- One individual from DVF requested that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first, that there needs to be more done to increase access to available habitat and that turbine mortality is a problem. Additionally, the population was not in a decline and biomass is increasing

Virginia Marine Resources Commission
Newport News, Virginia
July 25, 2014

Public Attendance: 11 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC
Rob O'Reilly, VRMC
Joe Grist, VMRC

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Two commenters stated that all states should have the same regulations

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 – Four people were in favor of the status quo
- Options 2 – 5 – One commenter stated that quota management would ensure only smaller eels are kept.

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- No comments given

Sustainable Fishing Plans

- One comment was given in support of the state sustainable fishing plans, specifically the fishing mortality plan.

Other Comments

- Two individuals from DVF stated that the regulations for the ½ by ½ mesh requirement and the 9 inch minimum size under Addendum III are unclear and inconsistent and a tolerance is needed and that the population was not in a decline and biomass is increasing
- One individual from DVF requested that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first, that there needs to be more done to increase access to available habitat and that turbine mortality is a problem.
- One individual expressed concern over poaching
- One commenters said that pollution and habitat degradation is an issue that needs to be addressed.

North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
Washington North Carolina
July 24, 2014

Public Attendance: 11 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC

Michelle Duval, NC DMF

Katy West, NC DMF

Kathy Rawls, NC DMF

Garry Wright, NC DMF

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- One commenter was totally opposed to a glass eel fishery in North Carolina.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- Option 1 - Two people was in favor of the status quo
- Option 2 – 5 – One person was opposed to quota management
- Option 6 – One person was opposed to quota transfers

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

- No comments given

Sustainable Fishing Plans

- One comment was given in support of the state sustainable fishing plans, specifically the aquaculture plan.
- One comment was given in support of the state sustainable fishing plans, specifically the fishing mortality plan.

Other Comments

- One individual from DVF requested that if any glass eel fishery was opened up that glass eel harvest licenses should be given to yellow eel fishermen first and that the population was not in a decline and biomass is increasing
- One person stated that we should wait to see the results of Addendum III.

South Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources
Charleston, South Carolina
June 11, 2014

Public Attendance: 12 members of the public. See sign-in sheet for details.

State and ASMFC Personnel:

Kate Taylor, ASMFC
Malcolm Rhodes, Commissioner
Ross Self, SC DNR

Bill Post SC DNR
Elizabeth Miller, SC DNR
Allan Hazel, SC DNR

Commercial Management Options

Proposed Glass Eel Measures

- Option 10 – One commenter was in support of increased monitoring
- One person commented that the harvest data the quota is based on is incorrect.

Proposed Yellow Eel Measures

- One person commented that the harvest data the quota is based on is incorrect.

Proposed Silver Eel Measures

Sustainable Fishing Plans

- One comment was given in support of the state sustainable fishing plan.

Other Comments

- Two people commented that fishermen should be allowed to fish in other areas.
- One person commented that glass eels are an important part of the ecosystem.
- One person stated that there needs to be more cooperative research with the fishermen
- Additional comments included that there is too much uncertainty in stock status, predation is an issue, and states should have the flexibility to manage their fisheries

American Eel Draft Addendum IV Public Hearing

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Brewer, Maine

June 30, 2014 at 3:00 P.M.

- Please Sign In and Print Clearly -

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company/Organization</u>	<u>City, State</u>
Wane Loring		Old Town, ME
Julie Keene	MEFA	Trescott, ME
Donald Bealy	Bealy Enterprises	Milbrook, ME
Lisa Somes	MEFA	Hancock Maine
Wayne Somes	MEFA	Hancock Maine
Dottie Davis	me FA	Machias me
Mike Klincelman	me FA	Eastbrook, me
JEFF CLARK	ME FA	Ellsworth, ME
Julia Beatty	Sea Grant / NOAA	Orono, ME
CITOL Woodcock	Sen. Collins	Bangor, ME
Justin Ranco	MEFA	Trenton, Me
Angela Young	MEFA	Waltham ME
David Young	Founder of MEFA	Waltham, ME
TERESA MONTAGUE	committee of ONE of candidate for House Dist. 129	Clifton ME
Tyran Gilmore	AESA	Woodwich, ME
Mar Feigenbaum	AESA	Portland, ME
Ron My Gregor	AESA	Gouldsboro ME
George Forini	AESA + MeFA	Sullivan ME
JOE MANNING	AESA	Sullivan ME
William Milliken	MEFA	Jonesport, ME
Jim Carochelle	Fisherman	Woolwich ME
Jeffrey Perre	MeFA	Dresden
Rustin Taylor	Fisherman	Mt. Desert
Leslie J Vance	MEFA	Trenton
Eli Duncan	campaign Aid to TERESA MONTAGUE	CLIFTON
Michael Clough	Fisherman	Ellsworth
Saul Love		Indian Island
Robert Starkey	MeFA	Gouldsboro

Name
Chris F. [unclear]

Company/Organization
[unclear]

City, State
Oldtown, ME

[Lined area for Name entries]

[Lined area for Company/Organization entries]

[Lined area for City, State entries]

New York



BUREAU OF MARINE RESOURCES



MEETING: ASMFCA - American Eel Public Hearing

DATE: 7/14/14

NAME	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE/FAX	E-MAIL ADDRESS
DEAN YAYA	SELF	765-9056	
RICHARD HUNTER		347-836-5382	captruchunt@Aem.ca7
Emerson Hasbrouck			
Carol Hoffman			
Edwin Chiofalo	FISHMAN	631-9879478	
BT Brennan	None	631-626380	spoke@optonline.net
Pho Starbee	Brooklyn Bayview	475-1129	N/A
B Lortwun	624 FISH COMM		
Arnold Leo	East Hampton Fishery Comm.		agleo@sover.net

